

REMARKS:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 8, 2005, Applicant respectfully submits the following remarks. Claims 1-45 are pending in the application and are currently under rejection. This response accompanies a request for continued examination (RCE).

Claim Rejections 35 USC §103

In response to the present rejection, Applicant reiterates the arguments presented in the prior Office Action response. In addition, each of the independent claims have been amended to call for the array of electronic equipment “*situated in at least one equipment rack,*” and “*the graphic representation further depicting the equipment rack with a graphic representation of each piece of equipment situated in a position of the graphic representation of the equipment rack corresponding to the physical location of the equipment in the equipment rack*” (or similar language). By way of explanation, without intent of imposing further limitations, the present amendment is intended to convey that the graphical representation of the rack mounted equipment is displayed in a manner such that the graphical image represents each piece of equipment situated in the physical position in an equipment rack (e.g., as depicted in Figs. 2 and 3) as it could be observed visually. This facilitates a technician quickly and efficiently identifying the location of a piece of equipment that is malfunctioning or is in danger of failure so that further investigation and possibly corrective action can be taken. These amendments are clearly supported by Figs. 2, 3, 5 and 6, and the descriptions associated therewith.

With this amendment, the claims even further distinguish over the combination of the Oliver and Wolton references (as well as the other references) of record. In Oliver, the objective is to view networks with perhaps thousands of elements. Oliver discusses various views in the form of hierarchical network maps that “*help graphically and spatially orient network elements that facilitate understanding of network topology of the network being monitored.*” (paragraph 0040) Oliver further discusses organizing views that can be defined by the user “*which explode the subnet and organize the elements and any subnet within the subnet in a logical manner*” which is “*intuitive and help the user grasp the network topology in a way that facilitates management of the network.*” (paragraph 41) This

extract from Oliver strongly suggests that any views proposed by Oliver are those which are logically organized from a network topology or functionality perspective. While limited geographical constraints might be implied, there is no teaching or suggestion adequate to meet the claim features as amended.

The Wolton reference relates to organizing information received from intelligent search agents. Wolton states at paragraph 0055, "*In the graphical representation of the invention, the agent search activity is preferentially represented in a two or three-dimensional animated visual map for according to a preferential method of mapping, such as for example the so-called tree, cube, zonal and sphere display types of the present invention.*" At paragraph 0057 it is made clear that the mapping being discussed is that of "*sites, pages, documents and links between them*". Paragraph 0060 further indicates that the documents can be "*images, or music files or video, or text files or software application executables, or postscript documents, or any other specified file types of documents*". Example representations generated by Wolton are depicted in Figs. 13-18. While Wolton describes some quite sophisticated methods for display of information regarding the sources of information found by intelligent agents, one learns little if anything about display of physical location of a defective or dying equipment in a rack of equipment as called for in the amended claims, and none of the representations illustrated would be of use in this regard.

Further regarding Wolton, while the Office Action asserts that sections 0060, 0161, 0233, 0329 and 0331 teach retrieving data representing measured parameters, this is not the case. The agents of Wolton retrieve documents, files and other information – there is no disclosure or suggestion that they retrieve measured parameters as asserted in the Office Action and as required by the claims. The above cited sections contain no such disclosure or suggestion. Applicant's prior statements in this regard are reiterated.

The other references of record are also not believed to provide further teachings relevant to the claims as amended. In view of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

Concluding Remarks

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the current claims as amended are not obvious in light of the cited references. Because the combination of the references does not teach, suggest, disclose or render obvious the claims as a whole including every element of the claims, the rejections of the claims are unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are hereby requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Although additional arguments could be made for the patentability of each of the claims, such arguments are believed unnecessary in view of the above discussion. The undersigned wishes to make it clear that not making such arguments at this time should not be construed as a concession or admission to any statement in the Office Action.

Please contact the undersigned if there are any questions regarding this response or application.

Respectfully submitted,



Renee' Michelle Leveque
Registration No. 36,193
Leveque IP Law, PC
221 East Church Street
Frederick, MD 21701
Phone (301) 668-3073
Dated: 8/31/05